

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

New claim 21 has been added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure of Applicant's application provides support for the amendments to the claims. For example, at least page 12, line 29, to page 14, line 4, and page 21, line 8, to page 22, line 8, of Applicant's specification provides support for new claim 21.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-21 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-13 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims render these rejections moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,046,268 to Ochoa *et al.* (hereafter "Ochoa") in view of JP 09-274909 to Miyazaki *et al.* (hereafter "Miyazaki"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ochoa discloses an electrode that is fabricated by providing a fines mixture that includes active material having a very fine particle size and by providing a second slurry or "non-fines mixture," of active material having a conventional particle size, with the second

slurry being coated onto a foil previously coated with the fines mixture. See Ochoa at col. 2, lines 48-65.

The Office argues on page 4 of the Office Action that Ochoa provides a secondary battery electrode comprising, among other things, a current collector and an electrode layer formed on the current collector and including a plurality of kinds of active materials that are different in electrical characteristic, as recited in claim 14. Claim 15-17 depend from claim 14.

However, the fines mixture and the non-fines mixture of Ochoa do not provide a plurality of kinds of active materials different in electrical characteristic, as recited in claim 1, because these mixtures use the same kind of material, only with different particle sizes. Thus, Ochoa provides only one kind of active material, not a plurality of kinds of active materials different in electrical characteristic, as recited in claim 1.

Miyazaki discloses a process of coating a current collector 5 by supplying a coating liquid from a liquid container 6 that is linearly moved in an X direction to provide a coating line. See abstract of Miyazaki. The current collector 5 is then translated in the Y direction and the coating of the coating liquid is repeated in the opposite X direction to form a second coating line. See abstract of Miyazaki.

However, Miyazaki does not remedy the deficiencies of Ochoa because Miyazaki also does not disclose or suggest a secondary battery electrode comprising, among other things, a current collector and an electrode layer formed on the current collector and including a plurality of kinds of active materials that are different in electrical characteristic, as recited in claim 14.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the combination of Ochoa and Miyazaki does not render claims 14-17 to be unpatentable because the combination of Ochoa and Miyazaki does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 14. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ochoa and Miyazaki in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0091896 to Watanabe *et al.*

(hereafter “Watanabe”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Watanabe fails to remedy the deficiencies of Ochoa and Miyazaki discussed above in regard to independent claim 14, from which claims 18-20 depend. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claim

New claim 21 has been added. Claim 21 depends from claim 14 and is allowable over the prior art for at least the reasons discussed above and for its respective additional recitations.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 22, 2010

By Kevin L. McHenry

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 295-4011
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Glenn Law
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,371

Kevin L. McHenry
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 62,582